Significance of "LOVE"

What several visitors notice after listening to Shri. Maharaj for some time is that he rarely uses the word "love" in his exposition of the true nature of man. In fact, he often says that in the manifestation of the unmanifested there is nothing religious as such.

~~If~~ a visitor ^ Specifically asks Shri. Maharaj if "love" had no place in what he expounds, Shri. Maharaj would smile and ask a counter-question: "What do you really mean when you use the word 'love'? What significance does the word have for you?" This question would generally so make the visitor speechless because the word is one of those which is hopelessly misunderstood and misused.

Shri. Maharaj would continue: "Does not the word 'love' basically signify a need of some kind and you 'love' the person or thing which satisfies that need, whatever it be? Indeed the love between a man and woman which satisfies the need of each for the other whether the need be physical, by way of companionship or in any other form or manner. When one finds that the other no longer satisfies the need, 'love' first turns indifferent and later on perhaps to 'hate'. Why do couples change partners, wedded or otherwise, so often, particularly in the west? - for the simple reason that they no longer satisfy each other's need as they could earlier.

Visitor: But surely that is a narrow view of the word 'love'. There must surely be something like 'impersonal' or 'universal' love?

Shri. Maharaj: Ah, let us be clear what we are talking about. ~~If we are~~ Are ^ we talking about a sentiment or relationship between two persons? If so, can love be really anything other than the interrelated opposite counterpart of 'hate' - both feelings that one person has for another? ~~But if you are talking about~~ Such a relationship can

only occur in a dualistic manifestation of subject-object. If you are thinking in terms of nonmanifestation, which is a state of total subjectivity without the slightest touch of anything objective, a something which can only be suggested by the subjective pronoun 'I' - total unity - which can only be conceived as a state of fullness, wholeness, holiness, no words can be adequate and a love-hate relationship would be quite inconceivable. Relationship between whom? If, therefore, you are using the word 'Love' to indicate this state, the word, like any other, would be inadequate.

Visitor: I, honestly, had not considered the matter so deeply or so analytically. Perhaps what I had in mind was what is meant to convey by the words "God is Love" or "Love is religion".

Shri Maharaj (laughing): Here again, my friend, what are these words but a combination of words which is based on some one's concept which he has liked and wished to thrust on others. And the 'others' are more than willing to accept any concept which gives them some status. In this case the seeker is very happy and self-satisfied in his pose of the seeker: he feels so much superior to the other misguided souls* who are *wasting their lives! and in this pose of the seeker, he is more than willing to hang on to a pleasing concept based on a pleasing combination of words which feeds his seeker-ego!

Visitor: But, Maharaj, the words 'God is Love', and used he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him' were used by St. John, a very great Christian Saint who is also considered to have been a Dnyaani.

Shri Maharaj: It is very clear that he must have been

a dungeon. But unfortunately, there has not been a clear apprehension of what these beautiful words meant to the Christian Sage who used them. What St. John had in mind was certainly not that "God" is an objective, phenomenal entity, whose essential nature is Love.

Now let us go back again to what I told you about need being the basis of love. Consider what is the most priceless possession of any sentient being. If he had the choice of retaining either all the wealth in the world OR his 'beingness' or 'consciousness', — or you may give it any name to add to the thousands that have already been heaped upon IT — without which that — which gives him the sense of being alive and PRESENT, and without which the body would be nothing more than a carcass of bones and bits and pieces, what would the sentient being choose? Obviously, without the latter, all the wealth in the world would be of no use to him. Indeed, THIS beingness, this conscious presence that he is, is the beingness of every sentient being on earth, the very soul of the entire Universe, — and indeed IN THIS-HERE-NOW, this Conscious Presence, is none other than (GOD). It is this which one loves more than anything else because one needs it to be alive and present. This therefore, is Presence-Love-God. And, St. John was very much conscious of this Consciousness, and when he said "God is Love", it is very clear that all he could have meant is that he and He were not different as pure SUBJECTIVITY, as Noumenon.